

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

**Status of Claims:**

No claims are currently being added or cancelled.

Claims 8, 13, 20 and 21 are currently being amended.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-4 and 6-21 are pending in this application.

**Claim Objections:**

In the Office Action, claims 8 and 13 were objected to, due to a minor informality noted on page 2 of the Office Action. Claims 8 and 13 have each been amended to correct this minor informality.

**Claim Rejections – Prior Art:**

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 6-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,630,056 to Horvath et al. in view of EP Publication No. 0747803 to Meyers et al. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claim 1, the Office Action correctly recognizes that Horvath et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed frequency divider. However, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Meyers et al. teaches such features.

In particular, page 5, line 13 to page 6, line 3 of the Office Action asserts that:

*“wherein each of said reception interface sections receives data, which is divided by said data sender to data of a data length shorter than one period length of said sync signal supplied from said frequency divider, from said data sender according to said sync signal (see Figs. 7A & 7B and page 14, line 36 to page 16, line 3 wherein*

*CS\_FIFO 102x/y of X/Y Interface units receiving 9-bit symbols/data at RCV Register 124 being held in one T\_CLK period from the transmitting entity/router is mentioned and also coupling of each symbol in the XMT\_Register 120 of the router to RCV Register 124 of CS\_FIFO 102x/y of X/Y Interface units with the T\_CLK is mentioned and also pulling symbols from the storage queue 126 with the synchronous RCV\_CLK and operating T\_CLK and RCV\_CLK in frequency locked mode to avoid overflow or underflow in CS\_FIFO 102x/y of X/Y Interface units is mentioned)”*

More specifically, page 15, lines 41 thru 43 of Meyers et al. describes “9-bit symbols” as in “the CS\_FIFO 102x, therefore, receives the 9-bit symbols at a receive (Rcv) register 124, where they are temporarily held (e.g., for one T\_Clk period) before being passed to a storage queue 126.”

However, Meyers et al. does not describe a data sender that divides sending data to data of a data length shorter than one period length of a sync signal supplied from a frequency divider. In more detail, the “9-bit symbols” described in Meyers et al. substantially differ from the “data, which is divided by said data sender to data of a data length shorter than one period length of said sync signal supplied from said frequency divider” recited in independent claim 1.

For example, according to the present invention as exemplified by claim 1, irrespective as to whether one period length of a sync signal is shortened, a reception interface section can readily receive divided data within one period length of the sync signal. On the other hand, the “CS\_FIFO 120x” of Meyers et al. may not receive the “9-bit symbols” within one period length of a sync signal if the one period length of the sync signal is shortened.

As described above, Meyers et al. does not teach or suggest “**each of said reception interface sections receives data, which is divided by said data sender to data of a data length shorter than one period length of said sync signal supplied from said frequency divider, from said data sender according to said sync signal**”, as explicitly recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, since Horvath does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned features of claim 1, as acknowledged on page 4, line 10 to page 5, line 4 of the Office Action, independent claim is patentable over the combined teachings of those two references.

Thus, independent claim 1, as well as independent claims 6, 7 and 12 that recite similar features, are not taught or suggested by the combined teachings of Horvath et al. and Meyers et al.

Also, with respect to dependent claims 20 and 21, they have been amended to recite features described on page 12, line 26 to page 13, line 3 of the specification, and as shown in Figure 3 of the drawings. Such features are not taught or suggested by the combined teachings of Horvath et al. and Meyers et al.

**Conclusion:**

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 3/18/2010

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

George C. Beck  
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819